DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 861 UD 013 721

AUTHOR	Yin, Robert K.
TITLE	Racial and Ethnic Identities in American Society.
INSTITUTION	Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.
REPORT NO	P-4937
PUB DATE	Dec 72
NOTE	17p.; Adapted from "Race, Creed, Color, or National Origin," to be published in 1973 by F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 401 W. Irwing Park Rd., Itasca, Ill. 60143
AVAILABLE FROM	Rand Corp., Publications Dept., 1700 Main St., Santa Monica, Calif. 90406 (P4937; $1.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Acculturation; Civil Rights; *Ethnic Groups; Ethnic Origins; Ethnic Relations; Ethnic Studies; Group Membership; Group Relations; Identification (Psychological); Immigrants; Minority Groups; *Race Relations; *Racial Recognition; Social Structure; United States History

ABSTRACT

The investigation of race relations, of social problems related to race and ethnicity, and of different racial and social groups, all presume prior information about the definition of racial or ethnic group identity, about the formation, maintenance, and dissolution of such identities, and about the importance of such identities in American societies. Put simply, we need to know what constitutes racial and ethnic differences, and why such differences are important. As in the study of the individual in society, there are two basic components in analyzing race and ethnic group identity: the characteristics of the identities themselves and the societal context within which the identities are important. These two components are only distinguishable in an analytic sense. The most important characteristic of these identities is that they are group identities. The distinction between group and individual identity leads to the observation that the assimilation process may be different for groups than it is for individuals. American society has continually defined basic human rights and economic and social opportunities according to racial and ethnic identities. Racial conflict has persisted throughout American history, marked by lynchings, urban riots, and other forms of violent confrontation. There has also been a revived awareness of other racial and ethnic identities; a consciousness of differences among white ethnic groups has, for example, resurfaced. (Author

ED 081861

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RACIAL AND ETHNIC IDENTITIES IN AMERICAN SOCIETY

Robert K. Yin

December 1972

P-4937

UD 013721

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Any views expressed in this paper are those of the authors. They should not be interpreted as reflecting the views of The Rand Corporation or the official opinion or policy of any of its governmental or private research sponsors. Papers are reproduced by The Rand Corporation as a courtesy to members of its staff.

RACIAL AND ETHNIC IDENTITIES IN AMERICAN SOCIETY

Robert K. Yin*
The Rand Corporation, Washington, D.C.

No single topic has dominated contemporary American society more than race and ethnic group identity. Racial conflict has persisted throughout American history, marked by lynchings, urban riots, and other forms of violent confrontation. Today, a racial emotionalism incorporating the worst forms of fear and mistrust by both black and whites is still pervasive. Although the urban riots of the 1960s have subsided, the domestic issues such as scatter-site housing and school busing that arouse the greatest emotions remain those related to race. The nation has yet to develop a consistent ideology for dealing with differences among black people and white people; integration, separatism, pluralism, community control, and benign neglect have all been tried at different times and in different forms. It is likely that racial tensions will persist until some viable ideology develops.

While black-white relations have always been an important issue in America, there has also been a revived awareness of other racial and ethnic identities. Indians, Mexican-Americans, and Puerto Ricans, for instance, have made their interests known as never before, both independently and in concert with blacks and orientals as part of the Third World peoples. Moreover, a consciousness of differences among white ethnic groups has resurfaced. This has been manifested most clearly perhaps in the popular arts, where a top television show, "All in the Family," promoted bigotry to stardom in the early 1970s, and where such books as *The Unmeltable Ethnics*, *The Decline of the Wasp*, and *The Ethnic Factor* have appeared with increasing frequency. The

---

*Any views expressed in this paper are those of the author. They should not be interpreted as reflecting the views of The Rand Corporation. Papers are reproduced by The Rand Corporation as a courtesy to members of its staff.

This paper is adapted from the introduction to a forthcoming book, *Race, Creed, Color, or National Origin* (edited by Robert K. Yin), to be published in 1973 by F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.

arousal of ethnic identities, even among those people whose families have not been recent immigrants, certainly makes one wonder whether such identities were ever lost, or whether indeed they have merely been overlooked until the present time.

Underlying the sensitivity about racial and ethnic identities is the fact that discrimination according to such social groups has formed the basic weave of the entire American social fabric and institutional structure. For example, racially segregated neighborhoods and schools throughout the country are the rule, and not the exception; ethnic group identities, whether based on religion or national origins or both, influence the choice of residence, employment, and life-style, especially in the country's large metropolitan areas. To be sure, there have been other social identities as well: at the end of the 1960s, a new sexist awareness raised important questions about anti-feminist discrimination; social opportunities have always been selective by economic class; and new divisions according to age have emerged, what with the large-scale development of nursing homes for the elderly and day-care centers for the young.

But race and ethnicity have been the outstanding dimensions for social identities in America. Race has been important because of the unique history of the American black people, a history that includes a severe form of human slavery and continued discrimination by skin color, especially against blacks, but also against yellows, reds, and browns. Ethnicity has been important because of the continued and significant migration of foreign peoples to the United States. In fact, the immigration factor has been so prominent in American history that Oscar Handlin has written, "Once I thought to write a history of the immigrants in America. Then I discovered that the immigrants *were* American history."* Although the flow of new immigrants in relation to the native population has decreased in recent years, the character of the recent migration *and* the declining birth rate of the native

---

*Oscar Handlin, *The Uprooted* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1951), p. 3.

population still make immigration a critical component of the nation's population growth.

RESEARCH ON RACE AND ETHNICITY

It would be entirely fitting, then, if race and ethnicity were the subject of continuing social inquiry, and if the basic facts of race and ethnic group identity were widely known, even if not well understood. But this has not been the case. In fact, until the last decade, race and ethnicity received relatively little attention from social scientists.* One can attempt to blame the paucity of research simply on the lack of financial support by government and other sponsors,** or one can attribute the paucity to the narrow interests of scholars themselves. In history, for example, few researchers were interested in studying racial or ethnic identities; scholars of white Protestant backgrounds tended to overlook the importance of such identities, and scholars of ethnic backgrounds tried to deemphasize their personal backgrounds by studying other subjects.*** But more likely, the failure to study racial and ethnic identities reflected an implicit value orientation maintained within American social science throughout the first half of the century.

During this time, social science thinking was dominated by an assimilationist doctrine, which held that all racial and ethnic groups ultimately lost their separate identities and adopted a unitary American way of life. For Frederick Jackson Turner, the American frontier was the scene of such assimilation; for Robert Ezra Park, the city

---

*This sentiment has been echoed in several articles. See Melvin M. Tumin, "Some Social Consequences of Research on Racial Relations," *American Sociologist*, May 1968, 3:117-123; Rudolph J. Vecoli, "Ethnicity: A Neglected Dimension of American History," in Herbert J. Bass (ed.), *The State of American History* (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1970), pp. 70-88; Andrew M. Greeley, "Ethnicity as an Influence on Behavior," in Otto Feinstein (ed.), *Ethnic Groups in the City: Culture, Institutions, and Power* (Lexington, Mass.: Heath, 1971), pp. 3-16; and L. Paul Metzger, "American Sociology and Black Assimilation: Conflicting Perspectives," *American Journal of Sociology*, January 1971, 76:627-647.

**This thought is pursued by Melvin Tumin in "Some Social Consequences," *op. cit.*

***Vecoli, "Ethnicity," *op. cit.*

played a similar role. The symbol of both scenes was the melting pot, a creation of the playwright Israel Zangwill, who fashioned the following lines for a play that opened in this country in 1908:

> America is God's crucible, the great Melting Pot where all the races of Europe are melting and re-forming! Here you stand, good folk, think I, when I see them at Ellis Island, here you stand in your fifty groups, with your fifty languages and histories, and your fifty blood hatreds and rivalries. But you won't be long like that, brothers, for these are the fires of God you've come to--these are the fires of God. A fig for your feuds and vendettas! Germans and Frenchmen, Irishmen and Englishmen, Jews and Russians--into the crucible with you all! God is making the American.*

Lest anyone underestimate the extent of Zangwill's imagination, even people of the black and yellow races were specifically mentioned as ingredients in the great melting pot. Thus according to the assimilationist doctrine and its melting pot analogy, people of different races, creeds, and national origins were assumed to work their way into American society, eventually to become indistinguishable from the general society. In this manner, the melting pot also served as an ideal symbol for the American democratic ethos; all individuals became equals in the United States.

The works of Turner and Park, though unrelated to each other, both exemplified the tone of research in their respective fields of history and sociology.** In sociology especially, interest in Park's "race relations cycle" and in the process of assimilation stood at the forefront of race and ethnic research, with Simpson and Yinger's *Race Relations* perhaps the most widely used textbook. In both fields, the normative "American way of life" drew the main research focus, serving as the standard against which racial and ethnic groups were studied.

---

*From Zangwill's play, as quoted by Milton M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 120.

**Vecoli, "Ethnicity," *op. cit.*

This meant that few investigators made racial and ethnic institutions the objects of inquiry on their own right.

The assimilationist orientation also led to one unfortunate oversight: little evidence was gathered to determine whether in fact all racial and ethnic groups were assimilating. On the one hand, there was a logical difficulty. If all groups were *eventually* supposed to assimilate, it was difficult to distinguish a genuine counter-example from a case of very slow assimilation.* On the other hand, the study of ethnic groups, like the U.S. census of population, simply lost track of ethnic identities after the first generation or two of post-immigration families. This added to the misleading impression that ethnic groups were disappearing, an impression reinforced by the statements of some researchers who actually forecast that ethnic groups had a limited future in the United States, as they were being assimilated so rapidly.** Similarly, the study of racial groups failed to recognize the severe racial barriers facing the black citizen, especially as the black population in the cities grew during the 1950s. For instance, two political scientists have noted that in their field, the prevailing pluralist view of community power*** vastly underplayed the extent of racial (or any other kind of) inequity in the city, and thus provided no hint of the subsequent urban riots. The riots were outward manifestations of conflicts that the pluralists had honestly not perceived.†

---

*Amitai Etzioni, "The Ghetto: A Re-evaluation," *Social Forces*, March 1959, 37:255-262.

**W. Lloyd Warner and Leo Srole, *The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945), pp. 295-296.

***The pluralist view stipulated that in urban politics there was a relatively wide sharing of power among different groups, and that there was certainly no power elite dominating the decision-making; see Nelson W. Polsby, *Community Power and Political Theory* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963).

†Stephen M. David and Jewel Bellush, "Introduction: Pluralism, Race, and the Urban Political System," in Bellush and David (eds.), *Race and Politics in New York City: Five Studies in Policy-Making* (New York: Praeger, 1971), pp. 3-24.

Only in the last ten years has research on race and ethnicity finally begun to increase. First came the gradual realization that the melting pot was an inadequate model, oversimplified at best and incorrect at worst. In *Beyond the Melting Pot* (1963), Glazer and Moynihan reviewed the persistence of racial and ethnic identities in New York, and stated simply that "The point about the melting pot...is that it did not happen."* Second, community researchers discovered strong ethnic enclaves thriving in the city (and resisting urban renewal) and even sprouting in the suburbs.** Third, the 1960s saw the production of several major studies of race and social policy, led by Moynihan's *The Negro Family* (1965), James S. Coleman's *Equality of Educational Opportunity* (1966), and the *U.S. Riot Commission Report* (1968).

Some of this research still fell into the assimilationist mold. It characterized people of different races as being inherently equal, and therefore gave strong support to a policy of racial integration. Integration, however, implicitly meant the assimilation of black people into white-oriented institutions and society.*** One scholar actually went so far as to claim the existence of a continuous line of research, beginning with Myrdal's *An American Dilemma* (1944) and culminating with the Moynihan and Coleman reports, that definitively established the major causes and effects of American race discrimination. He went on to suggest that, had government heeded these research findings and promoted a more rapid rate of racial desegregation and integration, some of the subsequent urban riots might have been avoided.†

---

*Nathan Glazer and Daniel Patrick Moynihan, *Beyond the Melting Pot* (Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1963), p. 5.

**The most notable studies were Herbert J. Gans, *The Urban Villagers* (New York: Free Press, 1962); William M. Dobriner, *Class in Suburbia* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963), especially pp. 65-67, 118; and Albert I. Gordon, *Jews in Suburbia* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1959).

***L. Paul Metzger, "Conventional Social Science and Racial Integration," in J. David Colfax and Jack L. Roach (eds.), *Radical Sociology* (New York: Basic Books, 1971), pp. 67-78.

†Tumin, "Some Social Consequences," *op. cit.*

But there are several difficulties with this position. First, the early documentation of racial inequality was not sufficient. For instance, few people anticipated the likely dimensions of racial discrimination or conflict in the North; as late as the Civil Rights Act of 1964, it should be remembered, integration was thought to be primarily a problem of creating change in Southern institutions.* Second, even if the documentation had been sufficient, the research, beginning with Myrdal's study,** did little to suggest what courses of action were available to government. (Precisely how one goes about desegregating schools, as we have learned, for instance, is not a trivial question.) Third, the line of reasoning gives no consideration to the possibility that there may have been a majority constituency to which government was indeed responding, and that, rightly or wrongly, the majority might not have wished the rapid removal of racial barriers. Finally, it is not even clear that the blacks wanted equality or integration on terms defined solely by white social scientists.

Other investigators during the last ten years have attempted to frame their research around the unique political and social development of racial and ethnic groups, without regard to questions of integration or assimilation; in fact, the identities of the individual racial or ethnic groups have been consciously preserved. This approach tends to follow the idea of "cultural pluralism," first set forth by Horace Kallen in 1915 and later revived by him and Adamic's *A Nation of Nations* (1944).*** Interestingly, the desire to study racial and ethnic groups in this manner is very similar to the doctrine of "cultural relativism" espoused in the study of foreign cultures. As

---

*See, for example, Nathan Glazer, "Blacks and Ethnic Groups: The Difference, and the Political Difference It Makes," *Social Problems*, Spring 1971, 18:444-461, for one treatment of Northern versus Southern differences.

**Metzger, "American Sociology," op. cit., makes this criticism of Myrdal's work.

***For a brief discussion of cultural pluralism, see Nathan Glazer, "Ethnic Groups in America: From National Culture to Ideology," in Morroe Berger, et al.(eds.), *Freedom and Control in Modern Society* (New York: Octagon Books, 1964), pp. 158-173.

described by one eminent anthropologist,

> The principle of cultural relativism has long been standard anthropological doctrine. It holds that any cultural phenomenon must be understood and evaluated in terms of the culture of which it forms part. The corresponding assumption in the organic field is so obvious that biologists have scarcely troubled to formulate it. The difference is that we, the students of culture, live in our culture, are attached to its values, and have a natural human inclination to become ethnocentric about it, with the result that, if unchecked, we would perceive, describe, and evaluate other cultures by the forms, standards, and values of our own.*

Studies in the mold of cultural pluralism have meant a reexamination of black culture and black family life from the point of view of black society in the United States.** The same ethos has led to the recent revival of research on such topics as sickle cell anemia, a disease peculiar to black people, and treatment of which will probably have little impact on the health of white people. The studies have also meant the realization that white American society is not a unitary society, but that it consists of diverse subcultures influencing residential, occupational, marriage, voting, and other social patterns.*** The very creation of the popularly used acronym "WASP," a term defined by E. Digby Baltzell fifteen years ago,† is perhaps most symptomatic

---

*Alfred L. Kroeber, *The Nature of Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952).

**For instance, see Robert Blauner, "Black Culture: Myth or Reality?" in Norman E. Whitten, Jr., and John F. Szwed (eds.), *Afro-American Anthropology: Contemporary Perspectives* (New York: Free Press, 1970), pp. 347-366; and Robert Staples, "Towards a Sociology of the Black Family: A Theoretical and Methodological Treatment," *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, February 1971, 33:119-138.

***For instance, see Andrew M. Greeley, *Why Can't They Be Like Us? America's White Ethnic Groups* (New York: Dutton, 1971); and Murray Friedman, "Is White Racism the Problem?" *Commentary*, January 1969, pp. 61-65.

†Baltzell used the term profusely in *The Protestant Establishment: Aristocracy and Caste in America* (New York: Random House, 1964). Vance Packard, writing in 1962, gave Baltzell the credit for defining the term. See Vance Packard, *The Pyramid Climbers* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962), p. 35. Packard himself used the term in *The Pyramid Climbers*, but not in his earlier work, *The Status Seekers* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959), suggesting that the term came into existence around the turn of the decade.

of the recent differentiation among white ethnic groups. Finally, one investigator has even carried the pluralistic approach so far as to suggest modifications in the application of "majority rule" in the United States.*

The general resurgence of research in the last ten years, however, has only slowly begun to yield sufficient information about race and ethnicity. Moreover, because of the heightened social conflict over matters of race, poverty, and war, much of the recent research has been overly (if understandably) concerned with the social problems created by race and ethnicity. In reviewing the research, one group of scholars has written that studies of race and ethnicity have generally fallen into three categories: (a) studies of individual racial and ethnic groups, with Thomas and Znaniecki's *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (1918) serving as a prototype; (b) studies of social interaction among racial and ethnic groups, typically concerned with "race relations;" and (c) studies of racial and ethnic groups from the point of view of social problems, e.g., job discrimination.** If we accept this typology, then it seems that while the earlier research on race and ethnicity was dominated by studies on assimilation and therefore fell into the social interaction category, the more recent research has been dominated by the social problems approach.*** One is hard pressed, however, to find many studies in the remaining category, i.e., studies on individual racial and ethnic groups. (In fact, one is hard pressed to cite other major works in the tradition of *The Polish Peasant*.) A solid core of research on racial and ethnic

---

*Herbert J. Gans, "We Won't End the Urban Crisis Until We End 'Majority Rule'," *New York Times Magazine*, August 3, 1969.

**John Harding, et al, "Prejudice and Ethnic Relations," in Gardner Lindzey and Elliot Aronson (eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1969, 2nd ed., Vol. 5), pp. 1-76.

***I have previously written about the shortcomings of the social problems approach in relation to urban studies. See Robert K. Yin, "Introduction," in *The City in the Seventies* (Itasca, Ill.: Peacock, 1972), pp. 9-17. The basic shortcoming is that the problems are defined by their societal context, and rarely in a theoretical context. For an elaboration, see Herbert Blumer, "Social Problems as Collective Behavior," *Social Problems*, Winter 1971, 18:298-306.

group life in the United States has yet to develop.*

The fundamental concern underlying studies in all three categories, however, is the same; it involves an understanding of racial and ethnic identities. In other words, the investigation of race relations, of social problems related to race and ethnicity, and of different racial and ethnic groups, all presume prior information about the definition of racial or ethnic group identity, about the formation, maintenance, and dissolution of such identities, and about the importance of such identities in American society. Put simply, we need to know what constitutes racial and ethnic differences, and why such differences are important.

UNDERSTANDING RACIAL AND ETHNIC IDENTITIES

As in the study of the individual in society, there are two basic components in analyzing race and ethnic group identity: the characteristics of the identities themselves, and the societal context within which the identities are important. To the extent that either there were no separate identities (e.g., all people looked and behaved alike), or there were separate identities but they were unimportant in the institutional structure of society (e.g., people looked or behaved differently, but were nevertheless treated equally), racial and ethnic group identities would be a less important matter. To be sure, these two components are only distinguishable in an analytic sense, for identities are often defined in terms of the societal context, and conversely the context can be defined as a composite of all group identities. Nevertheless, questions of identity can be treated somewhat apart from questions of societal context.

Turning first to the question of the identities themselves, one would have to claim that the most important characteristic of these identities is that they are *group* identities. Simple as it may sound, the point needs to be made explicitly to counter the popular myth that

---

*Although there are now summary textbooks of the existing research. See the two multi-volumed series, "Ethnic Groups in Comparative Perspective," edited by Peter I. Rose, published by Random House, and "Ethnic Groups in American Life," edited by Milton M. Gordon, published by Prentice-Hall.

we are a nation of individuals.* Far more important than the image of the United States as a "nation of immigrants," for instance, is the fact that the United States has been a nation of *immigrant groups*. This is because immigration has not been a random process, composed of individuals entering each year in equal proportions from other countries; it has been more of a wave-like process, with immigrants from certain countries dominating certain periods of time. Second, the immigrant groups came from countries that were at different stages of their nation-state development, so the groups had different preconceptions and aspirations upon arriving in the United States.** Third, the immigrants have not randomly scattered after arriving in the United States, either, but have settled in groups, with residential enclaves often surviving for several generations.

The distinction between group and individual identity leads to another observation: the assimilation process may be different for groups than it is for individuals. For instance, the mechanisms for individual assimilation might include intermarriage, a rising income, residential relocation, and a legal change of surname. Group assimilation, however, might include Milton Gordon's critical distinction between cultural and structural assimilation (groups may culturally assimilate by adopting American tastes and habits, but at the same time resist structural assimilation by maintaining strong within-group social relations);*** group identification as a function of generational differences (the third generation after immigration may show more identification with its Old World past than the second generation);†

---

*The myth, and the denials by people like Woodrow Wilson that minorities existed in American society, are described by Friedman, "Is White Racism the Problem?" *op. cit.*

**Nathan Glazer, "Ethnic Groups in America," *op. cit.* Some groups, like the Germans, can even be further differentiated into separate waves of people of different economic class. See Theodore Huebener, *The Germans in America* (Philadelphia: Chilton, 1962), p. 136.

***Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life*, pp. 60-83.

†According to Nathan Glazer, the phenomenon was not discussed until Marcus L. Hansen's "The Problem of the Third Generation Immigrant" in 1938. See Glazer, "Ethnic Groups in America," *op. cit.*

and the effects of U.S. diplomatic relations on ethnic group status (e.g., a rise of ethnic pride among Chinese-Americans may accompany the expansion of Sino-American diplomatic relations).* One suspects that the processes of individual and group assimilation are indeed considerably different, and we need to know a great deal more about both.

Turning to the societal context, racial and ethnic group discrimination and segregation have been American facts of life. First, even if it were true that all individuals in the country were treated equally, it would not follow that all groups would have received equal treatment.** This paradox is most evident in the recent surge of concern over institutional racism,*** whereby equal treatment of individuals (as, say, in the admissions procedures of a university) can result in systematic discrimination among certain groups of people (Chinese and Jews might be favored, while blacks and Mexican-Americans might be disfavored). The major objection to institutional racism is that it automatically reinforces group discriminations and unfairly maintains a status quo in American society, allowing those groups in power to remain in power. What makes institutional racism difficult to deal with is that it can take place even though individual people may be acting in good faith and in a nondiscriminatory manner.

Second, in actual fact neither individuals nor groups have been treated equally in American society. If judged by history, this conclusion is quite clear. Black people were enslaved and simply never meant to be covered by the original tenets of the U.S. Constitution. Only the Fourteenth Amendment, ratified in 1868 and reversing the Dred Scott decision, first spelled out citizenship and civil rights for

---

*For a description of the situation in New York City, see *The New York Times*, March 12, 1972.

**Nathan Glazer, "The Limits of Social Policy," *Commentary*, September 1971, pp. 51-58.

***For example, see Louis L. Knowles and Kenneth Prewitt (eds.), *Institutional Racism in America* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1969).

black people.* However, the Fifteenth Amendment, ratified in 1870, was needed to override existing state laws (including those of several Northern states) and to establish that no citizens would be denied the right to vote on account of "race, color, or previous condition of servitude." These amendments did not signal the automatic cessation of racial discrimination. Rather, states promulgated the use of poll taxes, literacy tests, "grandfather" clauses, and other residence requirements to prevent blacks from voting; to make sure that the point got across, lynchings were also used as a form of intimidation, with the peak year being 1892, when 162 blacks were lynched.** The problems involved in establishing basic civil rights for black people have continued to the present day, with key court decisions and new legislative acts, e.g., *Plessy* versus *Ferguson* (1896), *Brown* versus *Board of Education of Topeka* (1954), and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 all playing important roles.

Other groups have also been the subject of overt discrimination in American society. The Immigration Laws of 1921 and 1924, for instance, established immigration quotas according to the immigrants' country of origin.*** Since the quotas were calculated according to the proportion of people of various national origins already in the United States, many of the smaller groups received only token quotas. Moreover, these Immigration Laws were not the first to exclude people because of their country of origin. The Chinese had been the first to suffer from American exclusionary policies, with Chinese migration to the

---

*For general reviews of the historical documents pertinent to the civil rights of black people, see Albert P. Blaustein and Robert L. Zangrando (eds.), *Civil Rights and the Black American: A Documentary History* (New York: Washington Square Press, 1968); Stanley Feldstein (ed.); *The Poisoned Tongue: A Documentary History of American Racism and Prejudice* (New York: William Morrow, 1972); and Edgar A. Toppin, *A Biographical History of Blacks in America Since 1528* (New York: David McKay, 1971).

**Toppin, *A Biographical History*, pp. 143-147.

***For a description of the events leading to these pieces of legislation, see Oscar Handlin, *Race and Nationality in American Life* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1957), pp. 77-110.

United States eliminated by the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, an act that was extended twice before being finally repealed in 1943.* Within the United States, institutions have also been highly discriminatory. Perhaps the most overt examples of such discrimination were the quotas first established for Jewish students enrolled in institutions of higher learning during the 1920s. These quotas were sometimes concealed behind a number of subterfuges (e.g., the desire for equitable distribution among geographic regions), but in the case of at least one major university, they were the subject of open debate.**

American society, then, has continually defined basic human rights and economic and social opportunities according to racial and ethnic identities. Moreover, our discussion has stuck mainly with overt discrimination, and has not even touched upon the more covert and subtle practices of American businesses and institutions. The more caustic observer may claim that America has in fact been a blatantly racist society. Such an observer might cite the well known racial prejudices of egalitarian heroes like Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln as evidence for his view.*** He might also claim that virtually every egalitarian measure, as Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation,† has been

---

*See Jethro K. Lieberman, *Are Americans Extinct?* (New York: Walker and Co., 1968), pp. 9, 15-18. For a long time, the anti-Chinese sentiment was thought to be merely a regional prejudice, centered around the California area where Chinese workers were potentially a disruptive economic force. Recent investigations, however, have challenged this "California thesis," and have found evidence of strong national sentiments in favor of excluding the Chinese. See Stuart Creighton Miller, *The Unwelcome Immigrant: The American Image of the Chinese*, 1785-1882 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969).

**For a full discussion of the topic, see Stephen Steinberg, "How Jewish Quotas Began," *Commentary*, September 1971, pp. 67-76.

***Jefferson's "Notes on the State of Virginia," show that he personally considered blacks to be inferior to whites (cited by Feldstein, *The Poisoned Tongue*, pp. 46-53). In spite of these views, Jefferson appears to have promoted an anti-slavery provision in the Declaration of Independence, though the provision was eventually eliminated at the Continental Congress (see Blaustein and Zangrando, *Civil Rights and the Black American*, pp. 42-44). Lincoln's personal views on white superiority over black are documented in the Lincoln-Douglas debates in 1858 (see Blaustein and Zangrando, *Civil Rights*, pp. 162-172).

†Blaustein and Zangrando, *Civil Rights*, pp. 191-201.

motivated by political or economic expedience, and not by considerations of racial injustice. The more optimistic observer can argue that racial and ethnic discriminations, though serious, are nevertheless diminishing. He could cite Franklin D. Roosevelt's landmark executive order on employment practices in 1941, which incidentally first used the phrase "...regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin": the Civil Rights Act of 1964, whose equal employment provisions were the first to add reference to discrimination by sex; and the Immigration Act of 1965, which eliminated the national origins quota system.* Both observers have correctly stated the past. The question is, what will the future be like?

---

*On Roosevelt's executive order and the Civil Rights Act, see Blaustein and Zangrando, *Civil Rights*, pp. 356-359 and pp. 524-550; on the new immigration act, see Edward M. Kennedy, "The Immigration Act of 1965," *The Annals*, September 1966, 367:137-149.